the excess sum paid was recovered from the officers responsible both in the Account Office and in the Treasury. Recovery of the amount is a punishment by itself.

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla III*) : But the answer to part (*c*) says that, in the case of part (*a*), the amount was received back from the pensioner and the subordinates responsible for excess payment were punished. In the case of part (*b*), the amount over-paid was recovered from the officers and the subordinates responsible therefor. May I know whether it is punishment ?

PRESIDENT : The member tells you that he regards recovery of the money from the subordinates concerned as a punishment.
Next question.

Provision for leave allowances in the Budget.

13 ❋ **MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI** (*Tiruvalla III*) : Will the Government be pleased to state :

(*a*) whether they are aware that the Financial Secretary had replied, in the Public Accounts Committee meeting held on the 4th June 1935, that he was agreeable to make provision for leave allowances in the budget in future ;

(*b*) whether any such provision was made in the budget for 1111 ; and

(*c*) if the answer to part (*b*) is in the affirmative, the amounts for and departments to which such provision was made ?

RAO BAHADUR A. RENGASWAMI AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*) :

(*a*) Yes. The quesion has been examined as directed by the Chairman of the Committee. The Public Accounts Committee that met on the 17th and 19th June 1936 was also consulted. The Committee is of the opinion that the present system may continue, since, under the proposed arrangement, the provision made for leave allowances is likely to be diverted to other items within the grant, under the rules, that the present system is more economical and that the system in British India of including provision for leave reserve in the cadre itself is more costly. Government agree with the opinion of the Committee that the present system may continue.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) The question does not arise in view of the answer to part (*b*).

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla III*) : May I know the reasons which weighed with the Financial Secretary to admit that he was agreeable to make provision for leave allowances in the Budget ?

RAO BAHADUR A. RENGASWAMI AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*) : If it is possible, it is desirable, to make provision. But later on during the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Rao Bahadur A. Rengaswami Aiyar].

the question was again examined and the Committee came to the conclusion that it is not desirable to make such a provision for certain reasons One reason is that if leave allowance is made it is likely to be diverted to other items.

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla III*): That is not my question. I want to know the reasons which weighed with the Financial Secretary originally when he replied that he was agreeable to make provision for leave allowance in future?

RAO BAHADUR A. RENGASWAMI AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): It might have been on theoretical grounds.

PRESIDENT: Now, Mr. Velayudhan Pillai, you want to know why this was done. The answer is that, while considering the question, the Government consulted the Public Accounts committee and the Committee advised Government that this was unnecessary and Government accepted that view.

Misappropriation of money by the Official Receivers.

14 ***MR. S. J. NAIR** (*Nedumangad*): With reference to the answers given in the negative to question No. 7 of the seventh Session of the Assembly, on the 12th November 1935, *re*: the misappropriation of money that was the rental profit of a motor car in I. P. 46 of 1098 by the Official Receiver, will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) whether the Receiver, after having obtained permission of the Court, rented out the motor car involved in I. P. 46 of 1098;

(*b*) when he obtained permission of the Court;

(*c*) when he rented out the car;

(*d*) to whom the car was rented out;

(*e*) what was the amount, the monthly rent, for which the car was rented out;

(*f*) for how many months the car was rented out;

(*g*) when the car was released from the attachment and given out to the owner;

(*h*) whether the rental amount was deposited in Court by the Official Receiver;

(*i*) if the answer to part (*h*) is in the affirmative, when it was deposited;

(*j*) if the answer to part (*h*) is in the negative, why it was not deposited; and

(*k*) what action was taken departmentally against the Official Receiver for realising the amount misappropriated in this connection?

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Govern-*
t):

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) 30-2-1099.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly